

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/028,335	<b>Applicant(s)</b> STAMM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dmitry Suhol	<b>Art Unit</b> 3725	

**All Participants:**

(1) Dmitry Suhol.

(2) Howard Sobelman.

**Status of Application:** Allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 October 2005

**Time:** 4:30 pm

**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant  Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes  No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*Rejection with respect to Brilliant Beginnings*

Claims discussed:

1, 16, 23

Prior art documents discussed:

*Brilliant Beginnings*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and applicants agreed to cancel claims 16 and 23 to avoid possible obvious type rejections. Further discussed applicants affidavit made of record 2/10/05 and why the claimed invention is a successful. Discussed differences between the claimed invention and the system of Brilliant Beginnings, such as the activity items and links to specific future school skills as recited in the activity cards. .